REMARKS

STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1 and 6 have been amended. New claim 7 has been added. Claims 1-7 are pending and under consideration.

No new matter is being presented and reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS OF CLAIMS 1-6 FOR OBVIOUSNESS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER KUROSAWA ET AL. (U.S. PATENT NO. 6,047,288) IN VIEW OF COX ET AL. (U.S. PATENT NO. 6,510,466)

The rejections of claims 1-6 are respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Independent claim 1, for example, is amended herein to recite providing, when a request, specifying a particular application program, is received from the logged-in user, along with both the user ID and password used by the user to log in, the received request to the specified application program according to the group and the using environment corresponding to the received user ID and password. (See Fig. 9 of the present application for support).

In other words, according to embodiments of the present invention, as recited in independent claims 1 and 6, the user ID and password stored in a received packet are tested (see S1 and S2 in Fig. 9 of the present application). It is determined whether the user has already logged in to the server (see S5 in Fig. 9). Therefore, every request from a user is supposed to be accompanied by a user ID and a password, regardless of whether the user has already logged in to the server.

On page 3 of the Action, the Examiner notes that Kurosawa et al. fails to teach providing the request to the application program according to the user ID and password included in a packet of the request, as previously recited in independent claims 1 and 6. Thus, Cox et al. (hereinafter "Cox") is cited as disclosing this feature.

Fig. 4 of Cox (cited by the Examiner) outlines how the server processes a request from a client. However, according to Cox, at block 234, server system 22 determines if a received request is the start of a new user session. This request for a new user session is, in other words, a log-in request to the server 22. Therefore, Cox does not teach or suggest a request specifying a particular application program, is received from the logged-in user, *along with both the user ID and password used by that user to log in*, as recited in independent claims 1 and 6.

4

Fig. 4 of Cox also depicts a block 238, which determines whether the request from an already logged in user is requesting execution of an application. However, according to Cox, if the test made at block 238 is true, then the "application access management operations are executed to bring up an instance of the managed application for the user" (see block 240 and column 12, lines 65-66, of Cox). At blocks 282 and 283 (shown in Fig. 7 of Cox), the server checks whether the user's credentials are available. According to Cox, this test determines if the user has successfully logged on and provided the appropriate identification information (see also, column 15, lines 26-31, of Cox). That is, Cox suggests that the logged-in user's request for execution of an application does not contain, nor is it accompanied by, the user's password, since the user must have entered his/her ID and password during the log-in procedure.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the prior art fails to teach or suggest providing, when a request, specifying a particular application program, is received from the logged-in user, along with both the user ID and password used by that user to log in, the received request to the specified application program according to the group and the using environment corresponding to the received user ID and password, as recited in independent claims 1 and 6. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1 and 6 patentably distinguish over the cited references.

Claims 2-5 depend from claim 1 and inherit its patentable recitations. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-5 also patentably distinguish over the references.

NEW INDEPENDENT CLAIM 7

New independent claim 7 recites providing, when a request, specifying a particular application program, is received from the logged-in user, along with both the user ID and password used by that user to log in, the received request to the specified application program according to the group and a specified using environment corresponding to the received user ID and password.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 7 patentably distinguishes over the prior art for at least the reasons provided above for independent claims 1 and 6.

CONCLUSION

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot. Further, all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that

effect is courteously solicited.

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: _October 19, 2006_

By: _Michael P. Staley_

Michael P. Stanley
Registration No. 58,523

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501